

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,499	12/11/2000	Steve X. Chen	M-9546 US	3845

7590

05/19/2004

Steve Chen
NetOsprey, Inc.
2140 Shattuck Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94704

EXAMINER

ALAM, UZMA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

8

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RECEIVED

JUN 14 2004

Technology Center 2100

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/734,499

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Uzma Alam

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-68 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/11/2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 09/734,499	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Uzma Alam	Art Unit 2157	Page 1 of 2

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-6,119,155	09-2000	Rossmann et al.	709/219
	B	US-6,662,218	12-2003	Mighdoll et al.	709/219
	C	US-6,594,470	07-2003	Barnes et al.	455/67.7
	D	US-6,625,447	09-2003	Rossmann, Alain	340/825.27
	E	US-6,601,108	07-2003	Marmor, Eliyahu	709/246
	F	US-6,359,633	03-2002	Balasubramaniam et al.	345/760
	G	US-5,963,969	10-1999	Tidwell, William A.	715/531
	H	US-6,658,167	12-2003	Lee et al.	382/305
	I	US-6,711,611	03-2004	Hanhan, Musa	709/218
	J	US-6,509,913	01-2003	Martin et al.	345/762
	K	US-6,598,076	07-2003	Chang et al.	709/206
	L	US-6,654,814	11-2003	Britton et al.	709/246
	M	US-6,304,746	10-2001	Fascenda et al.	340/7.53

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 09/734,499	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Uzma Alam	Art Unit 2157	Page 2 of 2

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-6,487,597	11-2002	Horie et al.	709/227
	B	US-5,727,159	03-1998	Kikinis, Dan	709/246
	C	US-6,310,601	10-2001	Moore et al.	345/660
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the application filed on December 11, 2000. Claims 1-68 are pending. Claims 1-68 represent a method and server for controlling the transfer of Internet content to a limited display device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-11, 29-35, 37-39, 45, 57 and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rossman et al. US Patent No. 6,119,155. Rossman discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a method for accelerating the navigation of hypertext pages (see abstract).

As per claim 1, Rossman discloses a content control server for controlling the transfer of Internet content to a limited-display device

the content control server operable to communicate with a web server and the limited-display device (a wireless device communicates with the Internet; column 5, lines 6-40),

the content control server configured to store a customized parsing script (the server stores information on parsing document; column 5, lines 40-51),

Art Unit: 2157

the content control server further configured to receive a user request for Internet content to be displayed on the limited-display device (user requests information from a wireless device from a web site; column 6, lines 11-32),

the content control server further configured to execute the customized parsing script to parse items in the user-requested Internet content in real time (send the user the web page in the form of cards; column 7, lines 33-67; column 8, lines 43-66),

the content control server further configured to transfer parsed Internet content to the limited-display device (sending the cards to the wireless device; column 7, lines 2—33; column 8, lines 24-34).

As per claim 6, Rossman discloses a content control server for controlling the transfer of Internet content to a limited-display device,

the content control server operable to communicate with a web server and the limited-display device (a wireless device communicates with the Internet; column 5, lines 6-40),

the content control server configured to receive a request for Internet content to be displayed on the limited-display device (user requests information from a wireless device from a web site; column 6, lines 11-32),

the content control server being further configured to parse PC-formatted Internet content in real time (send the user the web page in the form of cards; column 7, lines 33-67; column 8, lines 43-66),

Art Unit: 2157

the content control server being further configured to transfer the parsed Internet content to the limited-display device (sending the cards to the wireless device; column 7, lines 2—33; column 8, lines 24-34).

As per claim 33, Rossman discloses a method of transferring Internet content to a limited-display device, the method comprising:

receiving a first request for Internet content to be displayed on a limited-display device (user requests information from a wireless device from a web site; column 6, lines 11-32);

transforming PC-formatted Internet content into limited-display-formatted Internet content in real time (send the user the web page in the form of cards; column 7, lines 33-67; column 8, lines 43-66); and

transferring the limited-display-formatted Internet content to the limited-display device (sending the cards to the wireless device; column 7, lines 2—33; column 8, lines 24-34).

As per claim 2, Rossman discloses the content control server of claim 1, wherein the items comprise a navigation link, a piece of text, or a graphic (column 8, lines 65-67; column 9, lines 1-20).

As per claim 3, Rossman discloses the content control server of claim 1 further configured to modify the items in the user-requested Internet content before transferring the items to the limited-display device (modifying the cards before sending the cards to the wireless device; column 14, lines 30-43).

As per claim 4, Rossman discloses the content control server of claim 1 further configured to format the items in the user-requested Internet content to at least one specification of the limited-display device before transferring the items to the limited-display device (transferring the information based on the size of the display; column 11, lines 34-51).

As per claim 5, Rossman discloses the content control server of claim 1 further configured to store one or more freeform parsing scripts, the content control server further configured to execute a freeform parsing script to parse items in the user-requested Internet content in real time (column 13, lines 55-67; column 14, lines 1-43).

As per claim 7, Rossman discloses the content control server of claim 6, wherein the requested Internet content comprises a web page (column 2, lines 35-63; column 4, lines 20-47; column 5, lines 6-27).

As per claim 8, Rossman discloses the content control server of claim 6 further configured to separate the requested Internet content into a navigation link, a graphic, or a piece of text (column 8, lines 65-67; column 9, lines 1-20).

As per claims 9 and 37, Rossman discloses the content control server and method of claims 6 and 33 further configured to remove a navigation links from the requested Internet

Art Unit: 2157

content to form the parsed Internet content transferred to the limited-display device (remove links to make space on the display; column 3, lines 4-19; column 12, lines 18-34).

As per claims 10 and 38, Rossman discloses the content control server and method of claims 6 and 33 further configured to group at least two navigation links together from the requested Internet content to form one navigation link in the parsed Internet content transferred to the limited-display device (combining links; column 6, lines 32-40; column 7, lines 33-46).

As per claims 11 and 39, Rossman discloses the content control server and method of claims 6 and 33 further configured to condense at least one navigation link in the requested Internet content to form the parsed Internet content transferred to the limited-display device (making links smaller by putting combination links into one link; column 11, lines 44-64).

As per claim 30, Rossman discloses the content control server of claim 6, wherein the limited-display device is a wireless phone (column 1, lines 38-51; column 2, lines 66-67; column 3, lines 1-3; column 4, lines 62-67; column 5, lines 1-5).

As per claims 29 and 57, Rossman discloses the content control server and method of claims 6 and 33, wherein the content control server groups together items in the requested Internet content that are not transferred with the parsed Internet content and provides a navigation link for a user to request the non-transferred items (combining links; column 6, lines 32-40; column 7, lines 33-46).

As per claim 31, Rossman discloses the content control server of claim 6, wherein the limited-display device is a personal digital assistant (PDA) (column 1, lines 38-51; column 2, line 66-67; column 3, lines 1-3; column 4, line s62-67; column 5, lines 1-5).

As per claim 32, Rossman discloses the content control server of claim 6 further configured to communicate with a computer, the content control server further configured to receive a request from the computer for Internet content to be displayed on the limited-display device (column 2, lines 35-63; column 4, lines 13-65; column 5, lines 6-27).

As per claim 34, Rossman discloses the method of claim 33, further comprising:

determining whether there is a customized parsing script for a PC-size web page with the requested Internet content (the server stores information on parsing document; column 5, lines 40-51);

if there is a customized parsing script for the PC-size web page with the requested Internet content, using the customized parsing script to transform the PC-size web page into a limited-display web page (send the user the web page in the form of cards; column 7, lines 33-67; column 8, lines 43-66); and

if there is no customized parsing script for the PC-size web page with the requested Internet content, using a freeform parsing script to transform the PC-size web page into a limited-display web page(column 13, lines 55-67; column 14, lines 1-43).

As per claim 35, Rossman discloses the method of claim 34, further comprising formatting the limited-display web page to at least one specification of the limited-display device before transferring the limited-display web page to the limited-display device (transferring the information based on the size of the display; column 11, lines 34-51).

As per claim 45, Rossman discloses the method of claim 33, wherein transforming PC-formatted Internet content comprises removing a navigation link or graphic in the PC-formatted Internet content to form the limited-display-formatted Internet content (remove links to make space on the display; column 3, lines 4-19; column 12, lines 18-34).

As per claim 66, Rossman discloses the method of claim 33, wherein the limited-display device is a wireless device, further comprising displaying the limited-display-formatted Internet content on the limited-display, wireless device (column 1, lines 38-51; column 2, lines 66-67; column 3, lines 1-3; column 4, lines 62-67; column 5, lines 1-5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12, 13, 19, 21, 36, 40, 41, 48, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rossman et al. US Patent No. 6,119,155 in view of Mighdoll et al. US Patent No. 6,662,218. Mighdoll discloses the invention as claimed including providing a document to a client coupled to a server (see abstract).

As per claims 12 and 40, Rossman discloses the content control server and method of claims 6 and 33. Rossman does not disclose the server and method further configured to remove a graphic in the requested Internet content to form the parsed Internet content transferred to the limited-display device. Mighdoll discloses removing a graphic. See column 10, lines 4-67; column 11, lines 1-11. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the removing of a graphic of Mighdoll with the method of transferring a web site of Rossman. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to speed up web page transfer.

As per claims 13 and 41, Rossman discloses the content control server and method of claims 6 and 33. Rossman does not disclose that the server and method are further configured to reduce a size of a graphic in the requested Internet content to form the parsed Internet content transferred to the limited-display device. Mighdoll discloses reducing the size of a graphic. See column 10, lines 4-67; column 11, lines 1-11. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the reducing the size of a graphic of Mighdoll with the method of transferring a web site of Rossman. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to speed up web page transfer.

Art Unit: 2157

As per claims 19 and 48, Rossman discloses the content control server and method claims 6 and 33. Rossman does not disclose that the method and server are further configured to remove an item in the requested Internet content based on a date when the item was added in the requested Internet content to form the parsed Internet content for the limited-display device. Mighdoll discloses to remove an item based on the date. See column 5, lines 65-67; column 6, lines 1-67; column 12, lines 17-47. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine transferring content of Rossman with basing the transfer of the content on the date of Mighdoll. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to have only the most recent dated document to conserve processing time and power.

As per claims 21 and 50, Rossman discloses the content control server and method of claims 6 and 33. Rossman does not disclose the server and method further configured to remove one or more items below a top item in the requested Internet content to form the parsed Internet content for the limited-display device. Mighdoll discloses the server to only send the top item. See column 11, lines 52-65. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the transferring of content of Rossman with the sending of only the top item of Mighdoll. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to speed up web page transfer.

As per claim 36, Rossman discloses method of claim 33. Rossman does not disclose the method further comprising: caching the limited-display-formatted Internet content;

Art Unit: 2157

receiving a second request for Internet content to be displayed on a limited-display device;

determining whether the second request for Internet content matches the first request for Internet content; and

if the second request for Internet content matches the first request for Internet content, transferring the cached limited-display-formatted Internet content to one or more limited-display devices. Mighdoll discloses:

 caching the limited-display-formatted Internet content (column 12, lines 4-11);

 receiving a second request for Internet content to be displayed on a limited-display device (column 9, lines 64-67; column 10, lines 1-16);

 determining whether the second request for Internet content matches the first request for Internet content (column 12, lines 39-41); and

 if the second request for Internet content matches the first request for Internet content, transferring the cached limited-display-formatted Internet content to one or more limited-display devices (column 12, lines 41-46).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the checking of first and second requests of Mighdoll with the transferring of content of Rossman. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to save time in transferring the information.

Claims 14-17, 20, 42, 43, 44, 46 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rossman et al. US Patent No. 6,119,155 in view of Rossmann US Patent No.

Art Unit: 2157

6,625,447. Rossman discloses the invention as claimed including a two-way data ready device in communication with a server (see abstract).

As per claims 14 and 42, Rossman et al. discloses the content control server and method of claims 6 and 33. Rossman et al. does not disclose a server and method further configured to preserve a center column of text in the requested Internet content and move text on left and right sides of the center column to a less prominent location to form the parsed Internet content for the limited-display device. Rossman discloses the limitation. See column 52, lines 1-44; column 8, lines 31-57; column 10, lines 16-67; column 11, lines 4-57; column 12, lines 1-44; column 16, lines 4-22; column 23, lines 24-31. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the formatting of information of Rossman with the transferring of information of Rossman et al. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to interpret content and display according to a structured user interface.

As per claims 15 and 43 Rossman et al discloses the content control server and method of claims 6 and 33. Rossman et al does not disclose further configured to preserve a center column of text in the requested Internet content and distill text on left and right sides of the center column of text in the requested Internet content to form the parsed Internet content for the limited-display device. Rossman discloses the limitation. See column 52, lines 1-44; column 8, lines 31-57; column 10, lines 16-67; column 11, lines 4-57; column 12, lines 1-44; column 16, lines 4-22; column 23, lines 24-31. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the formatting of information of Rossman with the transferring of information of Rossman et al. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to interpret content and display according to a structured user interface.

As per claims 16 and 44 Rossman et al. discloses the content control server and method of claims 6 and 33. Rossman et al. does not disclose further configured to preserve a center column of text in the requested Internet content and remove text on left and right sides of the center column of text in the requested Internet content to form the parsed Internet content for the limited-display device. Rossman discloses the limitation. See column 52, lines 1-44; column 8, lines 31-57; column 10, lines 16-67; column 11, lines 4-57; column 12, lines 1-44; column 16, lines 4-22; column 23, lines 24-31. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the formatting of information of Rossman with the transferring of information of Rossman et al. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to interpret content and display according to a structured user interface.

As per claims 17 and 46, Rossman et al. discloses the content control server and method claims 6 and 33. Rossman et al. does not disclose further configured to determine relative sizes for a plurality of items in the requested Internet content and remove at least one smaller item to form the parsed Internet content for the limited-display device. Rossman discloses this limitation. See column 5, lines 19-65; column 6, lines 30-54. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the comparing sizes and removing on graphic of Rossman with the transferring of information of Rossman et al. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to speed up the display of a web page.

Art Unit: 2157

As per claims 20 and 49, Rossman et al. discloses the content control server and method of claims 6 and 33. Rossman et al. Does not disclose further configured to remove one or more items on left and right sides of a center item in the requested Internet content to form the parsed Internet content for the limited-display device. Rossman discloses the limitation. See column 52, lines 1-44; column 8, lines 31-57; column 10, lines 16-67; column 11, lines 4-57; column 12, lines 1-44; column 16, lines 4-22; column 23, lines 24-31. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the formatting of information of Rossman with the transferring of information of Rossman et al. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to interpret content and display according to a structured user interface.

Claims 18, 24, 47, 53 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rossman et al. US Patent No. 6,119,155 in view of Marmor US Patent No. 6,601,180. Marmor discloses the invention as claimed including a method for transferring information between a client and a server through a converter (see abstract).

As per claims 18 and 47, Rossman discloses the content control server and method of claims 6 and 33. Rossman does not disclose further configured to remove a piece of text in the requested Internet content based on a font size of the piece of text to form the parsed Internet content for the limited-display device. Marmor discloses removing text based on font size. See column 9, lines 34-51; column 4, lines 25-59; column 13, lines 46-67. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the not

Art Unit: 2157

transferring content based on font size of Marmor with transferring content of Rossman. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to speed up transfer time.

As per claims 24 and 53, Rossman discloses the content control server and method of claims 6 and 33. Rossman does not disclose further configured to generate an abstract from a piece of text in the requested Internet content to form the parsed Internet content transferred to the limited-display device. Marmor discloses generating an abstract. See column 4, lines 25-59; column 9, lines 34-51; column 18, lines 18-37. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the generating an abstract of Marmor with the transferring of content of Rossman. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this so that only a small portion of text can be viewed by the client.

As per claim 58, Rossman discloses the method of claim 33. Rossman does not disclose further comprising transforming items in the PC-formatted Internet content into non-English items to form the limited-display-formatted Internet content. Marmor discloses this limitation. See column 4, lines 25-59; column 9, lines 34-51; column 10, lines 64-67; column 11, lines 1-65; column 12, lines 56-65. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine transferring content of Rossman with transforming contents of Marmor. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to reflect the contents of the web page and to send information more accurately.

Claims 22, 23, 51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rossman et al. US Patent No. 6,119,155 in view of Lee et al. US Patent No. 6,658,167. Lee discloses the invention as claimed including a computer implemented method for modifying data to be used by a client application (see abstract).

As per claims 22 and 51, Rossman discloses the content control server and method of claims 6 and 33. Rossman does not disclose the content control server claims 6 and 33 further configured to remove an item based on a color of the item in the requested Internet content to form the parsed Internet content for the limited-display device. Lee discloses removing an item based on color. See column 6, lines 9-20. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine transferring of content of Rossman with removing content based on color of Lee. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this adjust content based on type of display device because of the use of different phosphors.

As per claims 23 and 52, Rossman discloses the content control server and method of claims 6 and 33. Rossman does not disclose the content control server claims 6 and 33 further configured to remove an item based on a brightness of the item in the requested Internet content to form the parsed Internet content for the limited-display device. Lee discloses removing an item based on color. See column 6, lines 9-20. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine transferring of content of Rossman with removing content based on color of Lee. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this adjust content based on type of display device because of the use of different phosphors.

Claims 54-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rossman et al. US Patent No. 6,119,155 in view of Tidwell US Patent No. 5,963,969. Tidwell discloses the invention as claimed including a document abstract system and methodology (see abstract).

As per claim 54, Rossman discloses the method of claim 33. Rossman does not disclose wherein transforming PC-formatted Internet content comprises generating an abstract from a piece of text in the PC-formatted Internet content to form the limited-display-formatted Internet content, wherein the abstract comprises a first three to five sentences of the piece of text. Tidwell discloses the limitation. See column 1, lines 49-57. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the transfer of information of Rossman with the forming of an abstract of Tidwell. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to reduce browsing times.

As per claim 55, Rossman discloses the method of claim 33. Rossman does not disclose wherein transforming PC-formatted Internet content comprises generating an abstract from a piece of text in the PC-formatted Internet content to form the limited-display-formatted Internet content, wherein the abstract comprises a first three to five sentences of the piece of text and the last three to five sentences of the text. Tidwell discloses the limitation. See column 1, lines 49-57; column 5, lines 60-67. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the transfer of information of Rossman with the forming of an abstract of Tidwell. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to reduce browsing times.

As per claim 56, Rossman discloses the method of claim 33. Rossman does not disclose wherein transforming PC-formatted Internet content comprises generating an abstract from a piece of text in the PC-formatted Internet content to form the limited-display-formatted Internet content, wherein the abstract comprises a plurality of nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs that appear more than a predetermined number. Tidwell discloses checking the frequency of words in the text. See column 5, lines 17-30. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the transfer of information of Rossman with the forming of an abstract of Tidwell. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to reduce browsing times and to give the most optimal summary of the text.

Claims 59,62 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rossman et al. US Patent No. 6,119,155 in view of Hanhan US Patent No. 6,711,611. Hanhan discloses the invention as claimed including a proxy system enabling a worker remote from a communication center and limited to a light computer device (see abstract).

As per claim 59, Rossman discloses the method of claim 33. Rossman does not disclose further comprising transforming items in the PC-formatted Internet content into audio samples to be output by the limited-display device. Hanhan discloses transforming content into audio samples. See column 10, lines 20-34; column 11, lines 36-67; column 12, lines 1-54. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine transferring of content Rossman with transforming content of Hanhan. A person of ordinary

skill in the art would have been motivated to do this access function that handheld devices could not otherwise access.

As per claim 62, Rossman discloses the method of claim 33. Rossman does not disclose wherein transforming PC-formatted Internet content comprises distilling a video piece. Hanhan discloses distilling a video piece. See column 10, lines 20-34; column 11, lines 36-67; column 12, lines 1-54. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine transferring content of Rossman with distilling content of Hanhan. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to achieve desired balance between memory usage; sound quality; and data transfer rate.

As per claim 63, Rossman discloses the method of claim 33. Rossman does not disclose wherein transforming PC-formatted Internet content comprises distilling an audio piece. Hanhan discloses distilling an audio piece. See column 10, lines 20-34; column 11, lines 36-67; column 12, lines 1-54. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine transferring content of Rossman with distilling content of Hanhan. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to achieve desired balance between memory usage; sound quality; and data transfer rate.

Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rossman et al. US Patent No. 6,119,155 in view of Martin Jr. et al. US Patent No. 6,509,913. Martin Jr. discloses the invention as claimed including configuring user interfaces (see abstract). Rossman discloses the method of claim 33. Rossman does not disclose further comprising: recognizing the limited-display device Internet content; and inserting advertisements related to the limited-

display device Internet content on-the-fly to be sent to the limited-display device. Martin Jr. discloses:

recognizing the limited-display device Internet content (column 4, lines 39-60; column 5, lines 9-41); and

inserting advertisements related to the limited-display device Internet content on-the-fly to be sent to the limited-display device (column 6, lines 40-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine transferring content of Rossman with inserting ads of Martin Jr. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to provide ads in a controlled manner.

Claims 64 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rossman et al. US Patent No. 6,119,155 in view of Chang et al. US Patent No. 6,598,076. Chang discloses the invention as claimed including email messages with attachments sent by a device to a wireless device (see abstract).

As per claim 64, Rossman discloses the method of claim 33. Rossman does not disclose wherein transforming PC-formatted Internet content into limited-display-formatted Internet content in real time comprises distilling an email. Chang discloses distilling an email. See column 3, lines 49-67; column 4, lines 50-67. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine transferring content of Rossman with distilling an email of Chang. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to reduce difficulty in opening an email.

As per claim 65, Rossman discloses the method of claim 33. Rossman does not disclose wherein transforming PC-formatted Internet content into limited-display-formatted Internet content in real time comprises distilling an attachment from an email. Chang discloses distilling an attachment. See column 4, lines 1-40; column 6, lines 17-37. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine transferring content of Rossman with distilling an email of Chang. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to reduce difficulty in opening an email and reducing processing power needed.

Claims 67 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rossman et al. US Patent No. 6,119,155 in view of Barnes et al. US Patent No. 6,594,740. Barnes discloses the invention as claimed including operation of a call center over wireless network links (see abstract).

As per claims 67 and 68, Rossman discloses the method of claim 66, wherein the limited-display is a wireless device. Rossman does not disclose wherein the wireless device is a PalmPilot or a Research in Motion device. Barnes discloses a PalmPilot and a RIM device. See column 4, lines 1-10 and column 5, lines 7-16. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the limited display device of Rossman with the devices of Barnes. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to use specific 3Com technology and to be part of a wireless links in a WAN as part of a call network.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rossman et al. US Patent No. 6,119,155 in view of Marmor US Patent No. 6,601,180 as applied to claims 18, 24, 47, 53 and 58 above, and further in view of Balasubraminiam et al. US Patent No. 6,359,633. Balasubraminiam discloses the invention as claimed including generating a hyperlinked abstract (see abstract). Rossman and Marmor disclose the content control server of claim 24. Rossman and Marmor do not disclose further configured to generate an abstract from a piece of text in the requested Internet content if the piece of text is longer than a predetermined threshold length to form the parsed Internet content transferred to the limited-display device. Balasubraminiam discloses the limitation. See column 5, lines 10-57. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine generating an abstract of Rossman and Marmor with determining the length of the text of Balasubraminiam. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to limit the amount of information seen by the client.

Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rossman et al. US Patent No. 6,119,155 in view of Marmor US Patent No. 6,601,180 as applied to claims 18, 24, 47, 53 and 58 above, and further in view of Tidwell US Patent No. 5,963,969. Tidwell discloses the invention as claimed including a document abstract system and methodology (see abstract).

As per claim 26, Rossman and Marmor disclose the method of claim 24. Rossman and Marmor do not disclose wherein transforming PC-formatted Internet content comprises generating an abstract from a piece of text in the PC-formatted Internet content to form the

Art Unit: 2157

limited-display-formatted Internet content, wherein the abstract comprises a first three to five sentences of the piece of text. Tidwell discloses the limitation. See column 1, lines 49-57. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the transfer of information of Rossman with the forming of an abstract of Tidwell. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to reduce browsing times.

As per claim 27, Rossman and Marmor disclose the method of claim 24. Rossman and Marmor do not disclose wherein transforming PC-formatted Internet content comprises generating an abstract from a piece of text in the PC-formatted Internet content to form the limited-display-formatted Internet content, wherein the abstract comprises a first three to five sentences of the piece of text and the last three to five sentences of the text. Tidwell discloses the limitation. See column 1, lines 49-57; column 5, lines 60-67. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the transfer of information of Rossman with the forming of an abstract of Tidwell. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to reduce browsing times.

As per claim 28, Rossman and Marmor disclose the method of claim 24. Rossman and Marmor do not disclose wherein transforming PC-formatted Internet content comprises generating an abstract from a piece of text in the PC-formatted Internet content to form the limited-display-formatted Internet content, wherein the abstract comprises a plurality of nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs that appear more than a predetermined number. Tidwell discloses checking the frequency of words in the text. See column 5, lines 17-30. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the transfer

Art Unit: 2157

of information of Rossman with the forming of an abstract of Tidwell. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to reduce browsing times and to give the most optimal summary of the text.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 61 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Fascenda et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,304,746 discloses providing formatted information via a wireless communication system.

Horie et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,487,597 discloses an information transmission apparatus connected to a personal digital assistant in a wireless manner.

Kikinis U.S. Patent No. 5,727,159 discloses low end computers browsing the Internet.

Moore et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,310,601 discloses a method to resize an image.


Britton et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,654,814 discloses tailoring content for a session.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uzma Alam whose telephone number is (703) 305-8420. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday 11:30am-8pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703) 308 - 7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ua


ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100